

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request entry of the following amendments and remarks contained herein in response to the Final Office Action mailed May 7, 2007. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments and remarks contained herein place the instant application in condition for allowance. Claims 86 – 103 are amended, claims 1 – 85 and 104 – 109 are cancelled, and claims 86 – 103 are pending. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these cancelled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Examiner Interview

Applicants first wish to express their sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Ouellette spent with Applicants' Attorney, Jeffrey R. Kuester, during a telephonic interview on July 13, 2007. During that interview, the below-referenced new elements of the pending independent claims were generally discussed in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,298,327 ("*Hunter*"). While no agreement was reached during that interview, Applicants respectfully request careful consideration of this response.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) & 103

The Office Action indicates that claims 86, 92, 98 and 107-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,298,327 ("*Hunter*"), and claims 87-91, 93-97, and 99-103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Hunter*. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections on the grounds that *Hunter* does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed elements.

In particular, Applicants note that all of the pending independent claims 86, 92 and 98 now substantially include the following elements, which Applicants submit *Hunter* does not disclose, "*receiving disclosure gift information associated with each innovation disclosure of the plurality of innovation disclosures; responsive to receiving the disclosure gift information associated with each innovation disclosure of the plurality of innovation disclosures, automatically updating an associated balance of stocked disclosure gifts.*" Support for such

elements can be found in the present specification, in accordance with one example, among others, on pages 182 – 197, and more specifically, on page 193.

Applicants submit that *Hunter* is completely devoid of any discussion of innovation disclosure gift information. Consequently, there is also no teaching in *Hunter* of automatically updating an associated balance of stocked disclosure gifts. As a result, Applicants submit that the presently pending claims 86 – 103 are clearly allowable over the art of record.

In addition, Applicants further submit that it would not be obvious to modify *Hunter* to include the above-referenced elements. Applicants contend that great synergy results from combining the claimed elements that would not be expected by one of ordinary skill in the art. In other words, Applicants respectfully submit that separate fields of endeavor are combined in a way that provides advantages not previously suggested or expected. For example, advantages are realized when scaling a large system for managing protection and licensing of intellectual property assets.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that improper hindsight reasoning should not be used to provide motivation for combining the receiving and storing of intellectual property asset protection data with the receiving of disclosure gift information and with responsively automatically updating an associated balance of stocked disclosure gifts. In essence, it is now established that a factfinder should be aware, of course, of the distortion caused by hindsight bias and must be cautious of argument reliant upon ex post reasoning. Consequently, Applicants contend that the claimed combination would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and presently pending claims be allowed to issue.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicants' response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**

By: /jrk/

Jeffrey R. Kuester, Reg. No. 34,367

100 Galleria Parkway, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948
Tel: (770) 933-9500
Fax: (770) 951-0933